



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,178	08/14/2001	Donald P. Matthews JR.	2875.0500001	8980

26111 7590 03/02/2010
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2437

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/02/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/929,178	Applicant(s) MATTHEWS, DONALD P.	
	Examiner JEFFREY D. POPHAM	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,28-30,32-36 and 44-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,28-30,32-36 and 44-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Remarks

Claims 2, 3, 28-30, 32-36, and 44-46 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 28-30, 32-36, and 44-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, with respect to the 112 rejection, Applicant argues, since figure 3 of the application shows there being both a path from the authentication engine to the crypto alignment block and a path from the crypto engine to the authentication alignment block, that claim 45 requires no change in order. However, the issue isn't that data can travel in both of those paths, one for decryption and the other for encryption. The issue is claim 45 referring to "the authentication operations" and "the encryption operations", which were performed in a particular order in claim 46 (authentication data being passed back for encryption). Claim 45 refers to the operations that occurred in claim 46, then states that "decrypted data generated by the encryption component is passed to the authentication component and aligned by the authentication component". If Applicant intends for the entirety of these actions, including generating an authentication code, combining the authentication code with remaining payload data, then encrypting the combination, then sending this encrypted data back for another round of authentication, there will be issues with respect to new matter. However, the Examiner has taken claim 46 as being the encryption aspects (in line with that described in the specification and claim 44),

Art Unit: 2437

and claim 45 as being the decryption aspects. That is why this is a 112, second paragraph rejection, as opposed to a 112, first paragraph rejection. The simple fix to this would be to make it clear that claim 45 is not using the authentication and encryption operations of claim 45 (which as stated above, include performing encryption operations on a combination of remaining payload and the authentication code), but rather is using different operations and/or data (since it is clearly a different operation as described in the claim and specification). This could be corrected by merely removing the word “the” before referring to the encryption and authentication operations. As an example, the first limitation could read “authentication operations are performed by an authentication component”. For additional clarity, the second limitation could read “decryption operations are performed by an encryption component of the chip” to clearly show that the operations being described here are decryption operations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 46 refers to performing authentication operations on data, then sending the result of the authentication operations to have “encryption operations” performed with the remaining payload data. However, claim 45

Art Unit: 2437

attempts to reverse this, stating that encryption operations (in this case, comprising decryption) occur before the authentication operations, and that the result of the encryption operations are passed to the authentication component. Since the independent claim sets forth a particular order in which "encryption operations" (apparently meaning either encryption or decryption) are performed, the dependent claims cannot change this order.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 3, 28-30, 33, 35, 36, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard (U.S. Patent 6,901,516) in view of Larsen (U.S. Patent 7,068,791), Huynh (U.S. Patent 6,983,366), and Fumy (Fumy, Walter, "Internet Security Protocols", 1998, pp. 186-208, obtained from Springerlink).

Regarding Claim 46,

Howard discloses a method for accelerating cryptographic processing of a plurality of data packets according to a network security protocol, comprising:

Receiving, in a chip, data for a first packet from an off-chip processor (Column 5, lines 36-57; off-chip processor sending packet data to the buffer memory, where it is retrieved by the ciphering processor);

Performing authentication operations on data for the first packet to generate an authentication code (Column 6, lines 16-25; integrity operations);

Performing encryption operations on a set of data in the payload data for the first packet, wherein the encryption operations on the set of payload data for the first packet is performed in parallel with the authentication operations for the first packet (Column 6, lines 16-25; ciphering and integrity operations being performed in parallel);

Receiving, in the chip, data for a second packet (Column 1, lines 6-10; Column 7, lines 33-44; and Column 7, line 66 to Column 8, line 6; processing subsequent packets received serially and interleaved);

Performing authentication operations on a set of data for the second packet (Column 6, lines 16-25);

Performing encryption operations on the authentication code, wherein the authentication code becomes part of the ciphered data stream itself (Column 3, lines 18-20; and Column 4, lines 11-14);

Passing the cryptographically processed first packet from the chip to the off-chip processor (Column 5, lines 46-57; the ciphering processor sending the data back to the buffer memory, where it is retrieved by the off-chip processor);

Wherein the authentication and encryption operations for the first packet are performed within the chip in a single pass (Column 6, line 58 to Column 7, line 9; parallel processing and explicit recitation of performing encryption and integrity encoding in a single pass); and

Wherein all operations necessary for encrypting and authenticating are performed within the chip (Column 7, line 66 to Column 8, line 6);

But does not appear to explicitly disclose that the packet comprises header data and payload data upon which the authentication operations are performed, combining remaining payload data for the first packet with the authentication code for the first packet, adding padding to the combined remaining payload data and authentication code for the first packet to generate a first packet data block having a predefined length, performing encryption operations on the first packet data block, or that authentication operations on the second packet are performed simultaneously with the encryption operations on the first packet data block.

Larsen, however, discloses that packets comprise header data and payload data and that authentication operations are performed on the set of header data and payload data of the packets (Column 7, lines 6-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the secure packet system of Larsen into the ciphering processor of Howard in order to provide multiple authentication codes within each packet, thereby allowing the system to determine whether a message came from a proper sender via the header's authentication code, so as to allow for adaptive retransmission, even when the payload of the packet was received in error (and thus, the packet's authentication code is incorrect).

Huynh, however, discloses that the authentication operations for the second packet are performed simultaneously with the encryption operations on the remaining data to be encrypted for the first packet (Column 2, lines 24-35; Column 6, lines 19-38; and Column 8, line 23 to Column 9, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the packet processing techniques of Huynh into the ciphering processor of Howard as modified by Larsen in order to allow another packet to be processed as soon as a particular resource (encryption or authentication unit) becomes available, so the system need not wait until the first packet is completely

processed before beginning processing of another packet, thereby allowing the system to process network security protocol data faster and more efficiently.

Fumy, however, discloses combining remaining payload data for the first packet with the authentication code for the first packet; adding padding to the combined remaining payload data and authentication code for the first packet to generate a first packet data block having a predefined length; and performing encryption operations on the first packet data block (Pages 198-199; encrypting the entire message, including the MAC, with padding being added to the combination of message and MAC when using a block cipher). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the network security protocols of Fumy into the ciphering processor of Howard as modified by Larsen and Huynh in order to provide security using secure, highly-used, and well-known protocols, and/or to gain cryptographic security between two parties and interoperability between differently coded programs.

Regarding Claim 2,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Fumy discloses that the network security protocol is SSLv3 (Pages 196-197).

Regarding Claim 3,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Fumy discloses that the network security protocol is TLS (Pages 197-203).

Regarding Claim 28,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Howard discloses aligning the received set data for the first packet (Column 6, lines 26-47; both MD5 and SHA-1 require padding of the data in order to ensure that the data is a multiple of 512 bits. This can be seen, for example, in the portion of Bruce Schneier's book, Applied Cryptography, as provided by Applicant in the IDS dated 1/21/2003); and Larsen discloses that the set of data comprises header data (Column 7, lines 6-45).

Regarding Claim 29,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 28, in addition, Howard discloses storing the aligned set of data for the first packet to accumulate a predefined amount of data before commencing the authentication operations (Column 6, lines 26-47; as just described, MD5 and SHA-1 require 512 before proceeding); Huynh discloses that the data is stored in a FIFO (Figure 5); and Larsen discloses that the set of data comprises header data (Column 7, lines 6-45).

Regarding Claim 30,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 29, in addition, Howard discloses that the predefined amount of data comprises 512 bits (Column 6, lines 26-47; as just described, MD5 and SHA-1 require 512 before proceeding).

Regarding Claim 33,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Fumy discloses aligning, for encryption operations, the set of data in the payload data for the first packet to provide the aligned data for the encryption operations (Pages 198-199; padding, for example).

Regarding Claim 35,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 33, in addition, Fumy discloses that aligning, for encryption operations, comprises adding padding (Pages 198-199).

Regarding Claim 36,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 33, in addition, Fumy discloses storing the aligned set of data in the payload data for the first packet for the encryption operations to accumulate a predefined amount of data before commencing the encryption operations (Pages 198-199; when using a block cipher, blocks of the same size are used;

therefore, the encryption operations will proceed once the block size has been filled); and Huynh discloses storing the data in a FIFO (Figure 5).

Regarding Claim 44,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Howard discloses that the authentication operations are performed by an authentication component of the chip (Figure 3); and the encryption operations are performed by an encryption component of the chip (Figure 3); and Fumy discloses that authentication data generated by the authentication component is passed to the encryption component and aligned by the encryption component (Pages 198-199).

Regarding Claim 45,

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 46, in addition, Howard discloses that the authentication operations are performed by an authentication component of the chip (Figure 3); and the encryption operations are performed by an encryption component of the chip (Figure 3); and Fumy discloses that decrypted data generated by the encryption component is passed to the authentication component and aligned by the authentication component (Pages 198-199; as the MAC is performed on plaintext data, the data must be decrypted before it can be verified using the MAC).

4. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard in view of Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy, further in view of Ganapathy (U.S. Patent 6,557,096).

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Larsen discloses that the header data for the first packet comprises content type and length (Column 7, lines 6-45; and Column 9, lines 1-23); but does not explicitly disclose that the data is aligned into rows of data where each row of data contains a single type of data.

Ganapathy, however, discloses that that the data is aligned into rows of data where each row of data contains a single type of data (Column 17, lines 38-55; and Column 19, line 35 to Column 20, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the data aligner of Ganapathy into the ciphering processor of Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy in order to properly align and format data before sending it for mathematical (in this case, authentication and encryption/decryption) operations, so that the data has any needed sign and guard bits prepended thereto.

Art Unit: 2437

5. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard in view of Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy, further in view of Gaytan (U.S. Patent 5,638,367).

Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy does not explicitly disclose that aligning, for encryption operations, comprises removing non-valid data.

Gaytan, however, discloses that aligning, for encryption operations, comprises removing non-valid data (Column 1, line 62 to Column 2, line 29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the data packing system of Gaytan into the ciphering processor of Howard as modified by Larsen, Huynh, and Fumy in order to gain better throughput and performance by only sending valid data past the buffer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2437

/Jeffrey D Popham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437